DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 896 RC 006 777

AUTHOR Bertrand, Alvin L.
TITLE Definitions and Strategies of Rural Development: A Search for Coherence and Congruity.
PUB DATE 24 Aug 72
NOTE 30p.; Address delivered at Third World Congress for Rural Sociology Plenary Session No. 6, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 24, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Community Change; *Cultural Environment; Definitions; Economically Disadvantaged; Government Role; Industrialization; *Political Influences; Population Trends; *Rural Development; Self Help Programs; *Sociology

ABSTRACT

The basic issues covered in this paper are (1) the determination of whether there is a clear rationale for a sociology of development and (2) a determination of the divergent strategies for the implementation of development programs which have advantages that transcend the preservation of certain philosophical orientations and political ideologies. The sociology of development is defined as a subfield of sociology which is devoted to a study of the theory, design, and implementation of action programs which are proposed for the purpose of deliberately and fundamentally altering social structures in the interest of achieving more efficient forms of social organization, as judged on the basis of values and goals considered worthy. The divergent strategies of rural development are described in terms of the self-help approach and the centralized planning approach. It is noted that development sociology offers an opportunity for sociology in general to become free of its provincialism and that a coherent sociology of development represents a new era of applied sociology. A 49-item bibliography is included. (PS)

DEFINITIONS AND STRATEGIES OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT: A SEARCH FOR COHERENCE AND CONGRUITY*

by

Alvin L. Bertrand, Chairman
International Committee for
Cooperation in Rural Sociology,
Department of Rural Sociology,
Louisiana State University,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, U.S.A.

Introduction

The theme for this Third World Congress for Rural Sociology was selected by a working group which met in Rome at FAO headquarters in the summer of 1969. This group included eminent scholars with diverse national and cultural backgrounds. It, therefore, must be considered a commentary on the appropriateness of the theme selected that a consensus was achieved in a relatively short period of time. This theme--"Development Policies and Rural Life"--was considered in keeping with research and action programs which were being implemented by rural sociologists and other social scientists in almost all nations of the world.

---

*Address delivered at Third World Congress for Rural Sociology Plenary Session No. 6, August 24, 1972, Louisiana State University Campus, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, U.S.A.

There was, however, concern among the members of the working group over the various interpretations which could and had been made of rural development. It was for this reason that the major theme was elaborated with the sub-title, "Possibilities and Problems, Contrasts and Convergencies". The addition of the latter was intended to make it clear that the Congress program would include discussions within a range broad enough to encompass all definitions, philosophies and approaches which might be offered. The hope was expressed that this strategy would be in the interest of working out mutually acceptable understandings.

In light of the serious nature of the deliberation with regards to the theme and program of the Congress and in view of the objective which inspired the decisions, it occurred to me that it would be appropriate to attempt a paper which was keynoted on ways to lessen the degree of incoherence and incongruity which characterizes the arena within which sociologists contemplate the field of rural development. My tact has been to scrutinize as objectively as possible the two separate but inextricably related issues over which controversy is centered. These issues are posed in question form as follows: (1) What exactly is meant by rural development or more basically, is there indeed a clear rationale for a sociology of development;[1] (2) Which of the divergent strategies for the implementation of development programs has advantages which transcend the

---

[1]Herbert Blumer, (1966:3) among others, has alluded to the confusion among sociologists over the concept of social development.

preservation of certain philosophical orientations and political ideologies? It is my hope that the comments I have prepared will serve to place the program of the Congress into its intended perspective, and that a small contribution will be made in the sense of elaborating the discipline of rural sociology.

Toward a Definition of Rural Development

In the preparation of this first section of my paper I had a basic aim: To derive a definition of the sociology of development upon which some sort of consensus might evolve; and, from this vantage point, offer an adaptation for rural development. This task did not turn out to be as simple and easy as I had assumed. Despite the fact that a voluminous literature exists on the general subject of development programs, I searched largely in vain for a common conceptual understanding. My search became even more futile when I looked for a consistent sociological model. After contemplatation of this dilemma, it occurred to me that an identification of the factors which have militated against an integrated theoretical framework and of the ideas upon which there appeared to be a consensus would serve ideally in providing a background for the definition I proposed. I was able to isolate eight reasons for the confusion over what development, or more specifically, a sociology of development, encompasses in a disciplinary sense. In presenting these reasons, and in my discussion on development strategies which follows, it is necessary to question the position and approaches taken and rather vigorously defended by certain writers on development themes. As an aside, I ask of those who would a priorily con-

demn me for blasphemy, to consider the evidence and to set aside thoughts which may block a dispassionate view.

1. The first reason for a lack of consensus on what development encompasses appears to be a function of semantic transition. The term development had little social science significance in a disciplinary sense as recently as 25 years ago. Until this time, the term was generally used to mean a simple process of natural evolution or growth. Lynn Smith (1967:2) and others point out that the change in conceptualization came about as a result of the programs of aid which the more advanced countries extended the less affluent nations. It was politically unacceptable to term the less fortunate nations "backward" or "poor", but such countries could be identified as "underdeveloped" or "developing" without offense. (President Nixon used the latter term in his address to the Russian people on May 28th of this year). With the adoption of this terminology, it was a natural consequence that programs of aid or assistance to technologically backward countries became known as development programs. This usage produced a certain amount of confusion, which has persisted, because similar programs had and were being administered domestically under other titles. What had been known before as educational programs, welfare programs and other assistance programs increasingly began to be referred to as development programs Sanders, 1970: 17-21 . The latter designation will probably achieve general acceptability, but this remains a question of the future.

2. The second event which has complicated the understanding of development is the plethora of adjectives used to describe this type program. Besides rural development, (Raper, 1970) it has become more or less popular to speak of community development (there is a Community Development Society in the U.S.A.), area development (Barringer, Blanksten and Mack, Eds., 1965), social development (Stanley, 1967), regional development (Shapiro, Ed., 1968), and even such compounded terms as socio-technical development (Foster, 1969:2), and community resources development (Wallace, Hobbs and Vlasin, Eds., 1969). Writers, such as the ones footnoted, either strongly imply or vigorously state that those who see development programs as more or less than what their pet title connotes are ill informed or uninformed. One can see why it is difficult to claim commonality in the face of such divergence.

3. The third reason for problems of definition and conceptualization is related to the goals of many earlier so-called development programs. These programs were frequently designed to induce specific, often politically inspired, change in the nations or domestic areas to which they were directed (Walton, 1972). These goals were never too clearly admitted by their authors who tended to cite technological or economic advances as their objectives. (Leagans and Loomis, 1971:viii) Later programs have tended to stress more humanitarian goals, and are usually more easily recognizable as social betterment programs (McNeill and Miller, 1971), designed to improve the "quality of life" (Powers, 1971:27-28). Despite this trend, there remains a credibility gap which hampers the development of a consensus.

4. A fourth reason which helps account for a lack of agreement on the nature of the sociology of development is somewhat related but nevertheless distinct from the third reason just given. This is the matter of differentiating between the concept of development and certain other terms which relate to change trends. Questions commonly asked and which indicate more than a minor state of puzzlement, are as follows: What is the difference between industrialization and development? Can development be distinguished from modernization (Netti and Robertson, 1966)? Are progress and development synonymous terms (Geiger, 1971:45-50)? Can a distinction be made between change and development (Zimmerman, 1970:3-24)? The essence of the problem has been well stated by Kent Geiger (1971:62) who notes, "...development has many different 'scientific' meanings, depending on the social background, intellectual experiences, and political purpose ...of the user."

5. A fifth issue on which views are unmistakably divided is more implicit than explicit in the literature. This is the question of whether or not development schemes are or should be relegated exclusively to "poverty" or disadvantaged populations. It is true that the majority of the programs which receive publicity are of this nature, but there is a detectable opinion that development, as a disciplinary subject, should not be narrowly limited to an arbitrarily selected class of people. Under the latter opinion, all segments of any society can benefit from development programs.

6. The reluctance of sociologists to devote serious effort to the building of the theoretical and methodological foundation

necessary for a major disciplinary thrust is a sixth reason for the lag in the emergence of a fully accepted sociology of development. Why sociologists have not been aggressive in working and writing in this field is not too clear. It is probably due in part to a feeling that the subject was outside the scope of the discipline, since the first work tagged as development was done by economists and political scientists. Parenthetically, representatives from these fields early discovered the need for a sociological input and have consistently urged sociologists to get into the act. Havens is blunt in stating that the plain truth is sociologists have been slow to respond to the questions economists (and others) have been asking of them (1969:98-99). A second reason which no doubt deterred some sociologists from moving into the area of development is its obvious applied nature. The latter explains, to my way of thinking, why most development work has been done by rural sociologists. At any rate, as late as 1966, Blumer accused sociologists of not only failing to identify the problem of development, but of using an array of unrelated studies to conceal a state of obscure thought (1966:10-11). The last few years have produced works which provide some rebuttal to this charge (Beal, Powers and Coward, eds., 1971). Nevertheless, the contribution of sociologists to the clarification of a sociology of development remains largely in the realm of things to be done.

7. A seventh explanation for the untidiness in the sociological approach to development is found in the views taken regarding the scope of such programs. On the one hand, there are those who relegate

this term almost exclusively to projects in underdeveloped countries externally sponsored and supported. By contrast there are those who think more in terms of domestic programs and seem to largely ignore international programs and efforts. It is trite and begging the issue to observe, as some have, that these two types of programs are widely separated by virtue of the social space within which they occur. The point is that a sociology of development must move toward a conceptual and procedural framework which offers universal application.

8. The final source of confusion over the nature of a sociology of development which I was able to isolate is, perhaps, the most profound. This is the distinct controversy which exists between those who explain and in effect reject development schemes because of interpretations derived from conflict theory and philosophy and those who follow versions of the functional school of thought and see development efforts as beneficial to societal objectives (Rhodes, ed., 1970). At the international level of fundamental point of departure is the claim by adherents of the conflict school that the nations of the First World (Western Europe and the United States) and of the Second World (Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union) use the rhetoric of development to intervene in the affairs of the nations of the Third World (the lesser powers in the remainder of the world), (Horowitz, 1966) to exploit them in an imperialistic sense (Walton, 1972:41). This logic is carried to domestic programs, with the interpretation that a ruling elite uses development programs to exploit a peasantry or other local population group over whom it has control. The representatives of what might

be termed the more traditional functional approach see development programs as primarily benefiting the host country or region, but with certain benefits to the country or region which supports the program as well. These two divergent views complicate the matter of a consistent development theory because of their contradictory underlying assumptions.

The eight problems just reviewed provide a partial background of information for one who would propose a definition of the sociology of development. For a more complete picture, it is necessary to present the notions concerning development over which there is little controversy.

The first generally accepted notion is that development has to do with induced or instigated change. The excellent Volume edited by Leagans and Loomis entitled "Behavioral Change in Agriculture" is devoted entirely to emphasizing this point (1971). It is inherent in this understanding that a deliberate attempt is to be made to alter the social structure[2] of the target population. This kind of change is in contrast to alterations in social units which occur in the normal course of events, such as population trends or changes as a result of technological progress. It is also different from change resulting from social movements like women's liberation or which is a result of disasters, such as wars or hurricanes.

---

[2]Keith Warner has an excellent statement on this point, (1971).

The second idea which is more or less universally accepted is that development programs are oriented towards a mission or goal.[3]. It has already been noted that there is divided opinion over whether or not the change sought should be justified in terms of its specific nature or as in the interest of the broader objective of a fuller existence for the target populations. The point here is that the applied nature of development sociology is always stressed. In keeping with this observation, I may note that Cebotarev and Brown have done an excellent job of outlining various development work strategies (1971).

A third thought which characterizes most of the writing on what constitutes a proper development program is related to the size of the target social unit. Although individuals or small groups are always admitted to be beneficiaries, programs are unmistakably and universally designed and defended in terms of change which effects a larger social entity. This is one explanation for the common practice of using a locality-group name, such as village, community, area, or region, as a prefix in describing development programs.

I am now at a point where a summarization and position is called for. The discussion I have presented indicates that a definition of the sociology of development which included the concept of change planned to improve life conditions in a relatively large population unit would attract little argument. However, a

---

[3]Irwin Sanders (1970:18-25) has noted four ways that those involved in development work seem to view it: as a process, a method, a program, and a movement.

meaningful definition must not only imply these concerns, it must overcome the disagreements which were outlined earlier. At the risk of being criticized as idealistic, but on the basis of what appears to me to be sound evidence and logic, I would suggest that a sociology of development must make the following conceptualizations clear. (1) that development programs carry no implicit or explicit connotation of underdevelopment (or undifferentiation as some have put it). Insofar as I can determine there are no societies or areas within societies which can completely escape a designation of needing improvement and all can be judged superior on certain criteria--there are always ways to improve conditions of life, despite a comparative advantage over others; (2) that development programs are not exclusively external (or international) in nature--domestic programs are not only clearly within the purview of development, but are probably more important than external efforts; (3) that the development concept transcend any exclusive areal or residence designation, such as community or rural, although specific programs may be limited accordingly; (4) that the change which development implies can not be measured exclusively in terms of specific economic, technological or political objectives--the latter must be associated with improvements in what has come to be loosely but popularly called the quality of life. It is thus that minor projects, such as clean-up campaigns, are at best questionably called development programs; (5) that development must be comprehended as more than a trend such as industrialization, or a process such as change, although it obviously encompasses such phenomena. To justify the

"dignity" of a full-fledged discipline, a sociology of development must call to mind a restructuring of social systems, including adjustments in the culture which supports these systems.

I now offer a rather short and simple definition. Development sociology or, if you prefer, the sociology of development, is a subfield of sociology which is devoted to a study of the theory, design and implementation of action programs which are proposed for the purpose of deliberately and fundamentally altering social structures in the interest of achieving more efficient forms of social organization, as judged on the basis of values and goals considered worthy.

In proposing this definition, I am careful not to imply a preference for one or another procedure or strategy for bringing about more efficient forms of social organization, or to specify goals which should characterize all development programs. These are points which will be clarified in the final part of my discussion.

Let me conclude this first section of my paper with a specific reference to the sociology of rural development. Once an acceptable conceptual framework for a sociology of development is apparent, a sociology of rural development becomes a sub-specialty in the same manner that rural sociology is a subspecialty of sociology. Rural development programs are in contrast to urban development programs but the two are inherently complementary when contemplated under the umbrella of a total society. It is a matter of interest and ego to me that development programs the world over have been overwhelmingly cast in a rural setting.

Divergent Strategies of Rural Development: The Issues of Ideology and Equifinality

Rural development programs (as well as development programs in general) are unquestionably designed by adherents of two major ideological-philosophical schools which in turn accounts for sharp contrasts in program approaches. As a consequence, there is an issue of equifinality, which can be put in question form--is one or the other approach intrinsically more efficient in achieving the goal of development? For lack of better terms, I will designate the first approach as one rationalized in terms of a "self-help" philosophy and the second approach as one rationalized in terms of a "centralized planning" philosophy. I shall characterize each approach in an ideal sense, but at the same time note a strong conviction that there are few, if any, examples of pure types. My discussion will enlarge on this comment.

The "Self-Help" Approach to Rural Development

Under the "self-help" philosophy of development there is an attempt made to enlist and inspire the willing efforts of the people themselves in the determination of change goals and in the implementation of programs to bring about the change deemed desirable. Representatives of government or other agencies outside the target system ideally play an organizational and informational role, and may even be helpful in obtaining material resources, but they are expected to maintain neutrality in decision-making episodes. This approach is appealing because of its apparent compatibility with democratic

ideology. A few quotations will demonstrate the basic ideological tenets of the "self-help" philosophy.

The Philippines have a well-known history of domestic development programs. The enabling national legislative act, under which this work is done was couched in "self-help" terminology, as can be seen from this statement: (Perpetua, 1961:17)

> The distinctive feature of community development is the participation by the people themselves in efforts to improve their levels of living with reliance as much as possible on their own initiative; and the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative, self-help and mutual help and make them more effective.

It is, however, in the United States where the "self-help" approach is proclaimed most vigorously, whether the program be international or domestic. The Agency for International Development has had the responsibility for most of the U. S. international development programs. The author of an official training bulletin published by AID notes that community development,

> ...is a process of social action in which the people of a community:
> -organize themselves for planning and action
> -define their common and individual needs and action
> -make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems
> -execute these plans with a maximum of reliance upon community resources
> -supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community.

At the domestic level, it suffices to note that the above ideas are central to the guidelines for the vast development programs sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Services in the various states. Many other examples of the "self-help" philosophy could be given, including much of the work done under United Nations auspices. However, the

above illustrations make it clear that the proponents of the "Self-help" approach stress policies and practices which maximally involve the people themselves in the development effort.

The "Centralized Planning" Approach to Rural Development

The "centralized planning" approach to rural development does not assume the approval nor the help of the target population in the implementation of a change effort. Rather, it is felt that decisions relative to the type of change needed and to the plans and procedures for carrying out the program are best worked out at central levels of government. Examples of this ideological orientation are also easy to find.

The most frequent references to the centralized planning approach are found in works which describe development schemes in the various socialist countries. There are some who may question whether the examples given are indeed development programs. However, I am convinced that the so-called "command farming" model which has been implemented under "five-year plans" in the USSR and other countries are bona-fide development schemes (Karcz, 1969). As far as I can determine, these programs had and have the same general objective as development projects elsewhere--that is the over-all improvement of the total society. The term "command" indicates the centralized planning nature of these programs. Although the information available to me on rural development programs in Mainland China was scanty, I found indication that the centralized planning approach was and is followed there. Walker states that the Chinese leaders

never made any secret of their long-term aim to collectivize agriculture (1968:398-399) In implementing this aim they emphasized the relationship between institutional change and productivity--the essential theme of all development programs. Ezra Vogel (1969:28), in writing about the progress of land reform program in Kwangtung, China notes: "Directives coming from central authorities to the local areas became more numerous and varied, covering virtually every aspect of society. This is the epitome of centralized planning.

A third example of centralized planning comes from Poland in an article on the collective farm experiment in this country, Wierzbicki tells how authorities not only nominated the directorate of cooperative farms, but decided upon the plan of work, the division of profits and the size of investment (1968:31). Other illustrations of this development approach come from Israel, where, as Weintraub and Shapiro note, centralized planning was characteristic of regional organizations and development (1965:292). Also, some of the development work done in the Polder area of Holland and described by Corstandse (1962) and others seems to have been of this type.

The study I made of the self-help and centralized planning approaches to development programs indicated that each had advantages which were cited by proponents in support of their stand, and disadvantages which were used by critics to discredit the approach. The principal advantage cited by champions of the self-help type of program is the involvement of the people themselves in the decision and program implementation processes. Such involvement is seen as having both sociological and psychological benefits which derive from

participation and the feeling of being involved in one's destiny. Another advantage frequently cited, is that local persons know their problems and people more intimately and this lessens the risk of objectives being jeopardized because of the ignorance of local beliefs and customs which characterize outside agents.

The disadvantages which are inherent in the self-help approach can be listed under two broad headings. First is what may be termed the inexperience and inertia of localites. Local persons, especially in disadvantaged areas, are prone to envision program efforts in terms of their personal experience and selfish motives. They seldom have the sophistication to comprehend problems in an over-all sense--that is, think in the abstract about societal-wide benefits. In addition, they are usually hard to recruit in representative numbers and even more difficult to keep interested over a period of time. A lack of progress on projects quickly dissipates their enthusiasm as volunteers and may even lead to more negative reactions. The second broad disadvantage of the self-help approach is the complex nature of societal structures. Very few problems can be solved utilizing only local resources. There must be a greater or a lesser degree of involvement with the centralized government agencies in the interest of obtaining needed expert advice economic resources, and technological items. This involvement tends to negate the idea of self-help to a certain extent. In summary, then, the problems which tend to plague the planners of self-help programs are a function of the long and risky volunteer process and of the outside help needed to get such programs underway and to bring them to a successful conclusion. These disadvantages are recognized by the practioners of the self-help

approach, but are generally excused as a necessary encumbrance of the democratic process.

Turning to the centralized planning approach, advantages are seen as accruing from the use of an expertise in the determination and implementation of programs. It is additionally held that resources can be marshalled more effectively, and programs fitted into the total societal picture more realistically.

Disadvantages of the centralized approach also are twofold in nature. On the one hand, outsiders--no matter how well intentioned and expert they may be--tend to breed suspicion and often have difficulty in obtaining the cooperation they need. Allied to this is the real possibility of making costly blunders because of a lack of understanding of local customs and deeply internalized values. Together these hazards may lead to an alienation from the central government, which can and has had rather fundamental implications for political processes. On the second hand, programs devised and supported from the outside have a "hothouse" nature, since they generally are promoted with little consideration for cost and efficiency. Therefore, once the initial agency support is withdrawn or diminished local people cannot or are not inclined to continue the level of investment needed to keep the program alive. These disadvantages are readily admitted by objective scholars who favor the centralized government approach. However, they defend the approach on the premise that planning in a development sense must be total societal in its comprehension and that this scope can only be achieved through centralized control.

The above quick look at the two main approaches to rural development leads us back to the question of equifinality we began with--is one or the other approach superior? I construed that the best way to answer such a question was to review evidence forthcoming from past development enterprises. This exercise proved most enlightening; at the same time it was disillusioning, at least from the biases I held. My first discovery was the astounding fact that neither approach to the development objective had enjoyed more than limited success. Gross, for illustration, speaks of the tragic failure of community development in India. Programs there were largely planned in the self-help tradition (1971:153-154). Father Madigan entitled his study of the failure of community development projects in the Philippines with the dramatic words "The Farmer Said No" (1962). Foster, after extensive study, concludes that U. S. aid programs have fallen far short of the goals set for them despite the recognized need and obvious good intentions. He attributes this failure to the approaches used (1962:1-8). Close observers of the rural development effort within the U. S. report uneven success, at best.

The centralized planning development program experience does not appear in a better light. Mihail Cernea stresses the concern which socialist planners had from the beginning over the reaction of peasants to programs forced on them from the outside, and the efforts which were made to change what was termed their social consciousness.[4]

---

[4] "The Co-operativization of Agriculture and the Economic Consciousness of the Peasantry", The Romanian Journal of Sociology, II-III, pp. 139-166. (No date)

Warren notes a trend toward decentralization of development programs in Eastern European countries, in keeping with the economic policy recommended by Liberman but inspired by the limited success of more highly centralized approaches (1970:44). The partial failure of the collectivization program in Poland and in parts of Russia and China is well know (Zimmerman, 1970:7). With regards to the latter it is noted by Bardhan, in an article comparing Chinese and Indian agricultural programs published in 1970, that in China the investment of inputs like organic and inorganic fertilizers and irrigation waters designed to improve levels of living has largely been ineffective. He places the blame principally on faulty planning and on the excesses of overenthusiastic but unskilled party cadres (1970:535).

The above is not to disparage development schemes but to show that one approach does not appear to have a clear and definite advantage over the other. Those programs which appear to have had the most success are in reality hybrids derived from a selective utilization of the advantages of both the self-help and centralized planning approaches. The famous Comilla story of East Pakistan so ably reported by Arthur Raper (1970) is a case in point. So is the Appalachian effort in Southeastern United States, where a combination of self-help and centralized planning was necessary to achieve development goals.[5] The research on agricultural development done

---

[5] A Search for Progress in Rural Appalachia (Raleigh, N. C., North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service and Tennessee Valley Authority, Circular Z-26, 1972).

under the auspices of the Agricultural Development Council contains many illustrations which support the thesis that combination approaches appear more successful[6] as do the reports of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the U. N..

In light of the above finding, I have concluded that some development planners have sacrificed a degree of success at the altar of incomplete information or ideology. A sacrifice of this type cannot be tolerated by a sociology of development which seeks success as a legitimate field of inquiry. With this conviction in mind, I have attempted to lay out the broad outlines of what I would like to term a more or less value-free strategy for planning development programs. Such a strategy would allow the flexibility which is demanded by the variety of conditions under which development programs are attempted.

1. The first necessity is a conceptual perspective which is in keeping with the definition covered in the first part of this paper. This perspective removes development efforts from the political and ideological arena and places them in the scientific realm. It also stresses that programs are designed to alter social structures so that individuals can more effectively cope with their environment, as Capener and Brown put it (1971:166-167).

---

[6]See the series published on various parts of the world by Agricultural Development Council, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10020.

2. A second caution is that development schemes must be worked out so that a healthy complementary relationship exists between the centralized authority and the local population. Leagans has called this phenomen on a favorable macro environment (1971:120). This relationship allows for outside inputs of expertise, resources and direction which are adjusted to the sophistication and need levels of the population and delivered through channels which are generally acceptable to the target population. At the same time it calls for the involvement of the individuals and groups which make up the target population to the extent of their capabilities and desires. Caution should be observed to prevent certain problems, such as what has been termed "cafeteria programming" (Jones, 1971). Those who are guilty of this kind of programming select only projects which show a quickly visible success in order to enhance their bureaucratic opportunities. Strenuous care should also be taken to prevent those in strategic positions from diverting resources for personal or non-development uses.

3. A third condition is that development schemes be planned inscfar as possible to take into account overriding cultural structures, such as stratification systems belief systems, land tenure systems, or technological systems. Antinoro-Polizzi stresses that development strategies must be worked out according to societal type (1971). To ignore or be ignorant of these structures will largely negate planning and resource investment. Marcel Jollivet and Henri Mendras bring this point out emphatically in their study of sociological indicators of importance to rural development in France.[7]

[7]Marcel Jollivet et Henri Mendras, Recherches Sur Les Indicateurs Sociologiques Du Development Rural, C.N.R.S., Groupe de Sociologie Rurale, Centre d'Etudes Sociologiques, France, Sous l'egide de la Fondation Rovaumont, no date.

Books, such as Rogers and Shoemaker's work on Acceptance of Innovations (1971) and Foster's work on the impact of technological change on traditional culture (1962) also contain many illustrations which support this point. The idea is that certain types of programs, such as some of the birth control and agricultural technology experiments will not succeed if they run counter to social practices which are deeply embedded in local cultures.[8]

4. The fourth guideline for planning development programs is to be aware that such endeavors always have derivative influences which go beyond the objectives outlines. These influences must be largely anticipated in order to prevent net negative effects from the change induced. This fact is most lucidly illustrated by Mihail Cernea (1971), who demonstrates the impact which the cooperative farm program in Rumania had on the structure of the peasant family there. Apparently authority patterns, courtship patterns and marriage customs all underwent substantive change as a result of the new way of farming. Another common derivative influence is the creation of a state of anomie or alientation. This happens when program officials induce a "crises of rising expectations" by promising more than can be delivered in the way of change and a better life. The danger of such an eventuality, is a complete despair and apathy. (Bertrand, Jenkins and Walker, 1970). In this regard, Deutsch stresses that certain development patterns have the net effect of weakening the social solidarity of rural groups and of making life harder on them (1971:38).

5. A fifth aspect of strategy applies more to international programs but has relevance for domestic ventures as well. This is

---

[8]Cepede's article on the development of rural zones in France Published as a document of OCDE brings this fact out clearly (1963).

the caution that development planning not be indiscriminately patterned on the host country model or what Pura T. Depositorio of the Philippines has called a transplanted approach (1971). There are, of course, some instances where this may be in order. However, deliberate attempts at cultural diffusion are always critized as political in nature and bring charges of neo-colonialism on the one hand or of the imposition of the ideas and values of one national region upon another on the second hand (Bilinski, 1969:151). The southern part of the United States has long complained that certain programs brought to this region were plots to impose northern and eastern values on the people of the region.

These five guidelines are consistent with the definition of the sociology of development given earlier. They do not encourage a particular ideology or specific technological or economic objective. However, there is no reason why development programs cannot be reconciled to particular political settings by simply not emphasizing political objectives or adapted for any specific types of change, so long as the social structural impact is in keeping with development goals. The refinement of the principles and procedures or programs for achieving the latter represents a challenge for those who would practice a sociology of development.

Conclusion

I would like to conclude with the admission that the challenge of a coherent and congruous sociology of development and of rural development is one which literally excites my imagination. In the first instance, I envision along with Dr. Detlef Kantowsky of the Federal Republic of Germany (1969), that development sociology offers an unmistakable opportunity for sociology in general to become free

of its provincialism. It is no secret that sociology has been taught and practiced with a definite regional bias, as Dr. Kantowsky charges.

I also sense that a coherent sociology of development represents a new era which will see appliced sociology coming into its own. This idea has been expressed by George Beal, Ronald Powers and Walter Coward (1971:iv). They suggest that,

> ...'the sociology of development' or 'developmental sociology' may represent a fundamental alteration in the hierarchy of objectives for sociology, in that applied sociology will assume a higher rank than it has held in the past.

Such an eventuality will mean a culmination of the hopes and convictions of many of us who have labored in experiment stations, extension services and other development oriented agencies in an effort to prove rural sociology as a viable discipline.

There is a final vision, which leads me to be encouraged and enthusiastic about development sociology. This is the goal which is inherent in the very nature of this sub-disciplinary field. Its practitioners cannot escape the charge to work for a fuller life in rural areas and elsewhere in the sense of engineering more efficient social structures for achieving whatever values are held most high. This appears to be what Charles Loomis had in mind when he called for a "development model" which would, "...more adequately explain and predict Gemeinschaft-like activity in order that more perfect individuals and groups may be created no matter what the ideology of the society maybe." (1968) If the above sounds somewhat idealistic and romantic, I, for one, am prepared to make the most of it. I am deeply convinced that this Congress, to the extent it fulfills its mission of bringing a sociology of rural development

into a sharper more coherent focus, will not only contribute to a better sociology but to a better world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antinoro-Polizzi, Joseph, "Societal Types and Development Strategies", Sociologia Ruralis, Vol. XI, No. 1 (1971), pp. 19-35.

Bardhan, Pranab K., "Chinese and Indian Agriculture: A Broad Comparison of Recent Policy and Performance," The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. XXIX, No. 3. (May, 1970), pp. 515--538.

Barringer, Herbert R., George I. Blanksten, and Raymond W. Mack, Social Change in Developing Areas (Cambridge, Mass., Schenkman Publishing Co., 1965).

Beal, George M., Ronald C. Powers, and Walter Coward Jr., Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development (Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State University Press, 1971).

Bertrand, Alvin L., Quentin Jenkins, and Marcial A. Walker, "Development in a Mexican Ezido: Beyond the Revolution of Rising Expectations," in Carle C. Zimmerman and Richard E. DuWors, eds., Sociology of Underdevelopment (Vancouver, B.C., Canada, The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 123-134.

Bilinski, Russell, "A Description and Assessment of Community Development," in Luther T. Wallace, Daryl Hobbs, and Raymond D. Vlasin, eds., Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development (Raleigh, N.C., Agricultural Polciy Institute, North Carolina State University, 1963), pp. 143-180.

Blumer, Herbert, "The Idea of Social Development," Studies in Comparative International Development, Vol. 2 (1966), pp. 3-11.

Buitron, Anibal, "Community Development in Theory and Practice," Community Development Review, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Sept., 1961).

Capener, Harold R., and Emory J. Brown, "Strategies for Implementing Development," in George H. Beal, Ronald C. Powers and E. Walter Coward, Jr., eds., Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development (Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State University Press, 1971), pp. 166-183.

Cebotarev, E.A., and E.J. Brown, "Community Resource Development--an Analytic View," Journal of Community Development Society, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1972), pp. 40-55.

Cepede, M., "Etablissements des Programes de Developpement des Zones Rurales et Coordinations de Divers Services," in Les Programmes de Développement Regional Rural Avec Réference Speciale Aux Zones Agricoles Critiques et Notamment Aux Régions Montagneuses (Paris, France, L'Organization de Coopération et de Dévelloppement Economiques, 66, 1963) pp. 85-96.

Constandse, A.K., "Planning in Agricultural Regions," Sociologia Ruralis, Vol. 2, No. 1-2, (1962), pp. 79-96.

Cory, Lee J., ed., Community Development as a Process (Columbia, Mo., University of Missouri Press, 1970).

Depositario, Pura T., "Problems of Applying Research Results and General Social Science Knowledge to Development: A Phillipine Viewpoint," in Proceedings: The 1971 Asian Regional Conference on Teaching and Research in the Rural Social Sciences, Los Banos, The Phillipines, 1971.

Deutsch, Karl W., "Developmental Change: Some Political Aspects," in J. Paul Leagans and Charles P. Loomis, Eds., Behavioral Change in Agriculture (Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1971) pp. 27-50.

Foster, George M., Traditional Culture and the Impact of Technological Change (New York, Harper and Row, 1962).

Geiger, H. Kent, "Societal Development: Notes on the Vestments of a Concept," in George M. Beal, Ronald C. Powers and E. Walter Coward, Jr., eds. Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development (Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State University Press, 1971).

Gross, Bertram M., "Learning About Planned Development," in George M. Beal, Ronald C. Powers and E. Walter Coward, Jr., eds., Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development (Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State University Press, 1971), pp. 153-165.

Havens, A. Eugene, "Some Factors in Economic Development," in Luther T. Wallace, Daryl Hobbs, and Raymond D. Vlasin, Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development (Raleigh, N.C., Agricultural Policy Institute, North Carolina State University, 1969), pp. 97-111.

Horowitz, Irwing Louis, Three Worlds of Development: The Theory and Practice of International Stratification (New York, Oxford University Press, 1966).

Jones, Garth N., "Cafeteria Programming: The Dilemma of Development Assistance," Journal of the Community Development Society, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall, 1971), pp. 53-61.

Kantowsky, Detlef, "A Critical Note on the Sociology of Developing Countries," Contributions to Indian Sociology, New Series, No. 3 (December, 1969), pp. 128-131.

Karcz, Jerzy F., "An Organizational Model of Command Farming," in Morris Bornstein, ed., Comparative Economic Systems, rev. ed. (Homewood, Ill., Richard O. Irwin, Inc., 1969), pp. 278-299.

Leagans, J. Paul, and Charles P. Loomis, Eds., Behavioral Change in Agriculture (Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1971).

Leagans, J. Paul, "Extension Education and Modernization" in J. Paul Leagans and Charles P. Loomis, eds., Behavioral Change in Agriculture (Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1971) pp. 101-147.

Loomis, Charles P., "Wanted - A Model for Understanding and Predicting Changes in Natural and Theropeutic Groups and Systems which are Gemeinschoft-like," Group Psychotherapy, Vol. XXI, No. 2-3, (June-September, 1968), pp. 131-136.

Madigan, Francis C., S.J., The Farmer Said No (Diliman, Quezon City, Phillipines, Community Development Research Council, University of the Phillipines Study Series No. 14, 1962).

McNeil, Harold M. and Robert W. Miller, "Community Development in the Appalachian Highlands," Journal of Community Development Society, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall, 1971), pp. 36-40.

Nettl, J.P., and Roland Robertson, "Industrialization, Development or Modernization," The British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 17, No. 3 (1966), pp. 274-291.

Perpetua, Antionio, "Community Development as a New Institution of Government," Community Development Review; Vol. 6, No. 2 (June, 1961).

Powers, Ronald C., "Role of Population Density in Determining the Quality of Life," Proceedings of the 50th Conference, American Country Life Association, 1971, pp. 27-38.

Prodipto, Roy, Frederick B. Waisanen, and Everett M. Rogers, The Impact of Communication on Rural Development: An Investigation in Costa Rica and India (Paris, France: UNESCO, 1969). Community Development Abstracts (Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, Dept. of State, 1964).

Raper, Arthur F., Rural Development in Action (Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1970).

Rhodes, R., ed., Imperialism and Underdevelopment: A Reader, (New York, Monthly Review Press, 1970).

Rogers, Everett M. and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach, 2nd ed., (New York, The Free Press, 1971).

Sanders, Irwin T., "The Concept of Community Development," in Lee J. Cory, ed., Community Development as a Process, (Columbia, Mo., University of Missouri Press, 1970, pp. 9-31).

Shapiro, Ovadia, ed., Inhabited Rural Centers in Israel (Rehovot, Israel, Publication on Problems of Regional Development No. 5, National and University Institute of Agriculture Settlement Study Center, 1968).

Smith, T. Lynn, The Process of Rural Development in Latin America, (Gainesville, Florida, University of Florida Press, 1967).

Stanley, Manfred, "Social Development as a Normative Concept," The Journal of Developing Areas, Vol. 1 (April, 1967), pp. 301-316.

Taylor, Carl C., Douglas Ensminger, Helen W. Johnson, and Jean Joyce, India's Roots of Democracy (Calcutta, India, Orient Longmans Limited, 1965).

Vogel, Ezra, "Land Reform in Kwangtung 1951-53: Central Control and Localism," The China Quarterly, No. 38 (April-June, 1969) pp. 27-62.

Walker, Kenneth R., "Organization of Agricultural Production" in Alexander Eckstein, Walter Galenson and Ta-Chung Liu, eds., Economic Trends in Communist China (Chicago, Illinois, Aldine Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 397-458.

Wallace, Luther T., Daryl Hobbs and Raymond D. Vlasin, eds., Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development (Raleigh, N.C.: Agricultural Policy Institute, 1969).

Walton, John, "Political Development and Economic Development: A Regional Assessment of Contemporary Theories," Studies in Comparative International Development, Vol. II, No. 1 (Spring, 1972), pp. 39-63.

Warner, W. Keith, "Structural Matrix of Development" in George M. Beal, Ronald C. Powers and E. Walter Coward, Jr., eds., Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development (Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State University Press, 1971), pp. 94-115.

Warren, Roland L., "The Context of Community Development," in Lee J. Cor[illegible], ed., Community Development as a Process (Columbia, Mo., University of Missouri Press, 1970), pp. 32-56.

Weintraub, D., and O. Shapiro, "The Role of Regional Organization in Rural Development in Iarael--Some Preliminary Remarks," Sociologia Ruralis, Vol. V. No. 3 (1965), p. 299.

Wierzbicki, Z.T., "A Case Study in Planned Social Change: The Collective Farm Experiment in Poland," Sociologia Internationalis 6 Band, Heft 1 (1968).

Zimmerman, Carle C., "The Sociology of Change in the Underdeveloped Lands," in Carle C. Zimmerman and Richard E. Duwors, eds., Sociology of Underdevelopment (Vancouver, Canada, The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1970).